



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/436,008	11/09/1999	STEPHEN B. ELLIOTT	RR2341	6014

7590 04/20/2004
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
P.O. BOX 969
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0969

EXAMINER

FOX, JAMAL A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2664

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/436,008

Applicant(s)

ELLIOTT ET AL.

Examiner

Jamal A Fox

Art Unit

2664

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 04/08/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brody et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,278,697. Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brody et al. in view of Miska et al. Claims 13, 15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brody et al.

Applicant argued that the present invention is simplified from that of Brody et al., "wherein a generic communication protocol must be created and utilized for transfer of communications between two devices having diverse communication protocols." However, one skilled in the art would recognize that the protocols and infrastructure in the present invention are generic.

2. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the invention of Miska et al. to the invention of Brody et al. in order to

Art Unit: 2664

make sure the transmitted calls are routed to and have reached their appropriate destinations.

3. Applicant argued that Brody et al. fails to show or suggest the conversion within a "network access function" within a "network edge switch" or communication into a protocol suitable for a recipient. However, one skilled in the art would recognize that Fig. 10 ref. sign 276 is a communications infrastructure that includes a "network access function" and Fig. 10 ref. sign 154 is a "network edge switch".

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamal A Fox whose telephone number is (703) 305-5741. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on (703) 305-4366. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/436,008

Page 4

Art Unit: 2664

J.A.F.

Jamal A. Fox

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. Chin', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

WELLINGTON CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600